

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/005,390	Applicant(s) ZAPPALA, STEPHEN M.	
	Examiner George R. Evanisko	Art Unit 3762	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) George R. Evanisko.

(3) _____.

 (2) Jenifer Haeckl.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 3 August 2005
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
103 rejections of claims 12 and 13
Claims discussed:
12, 13
Prior art documents discussed:
Krakovsky
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Although Krakovsky may not show the lead being adapted to be implanted at the suprapubic level of the neurovascular bundle of the phallus, Krakovsky still is capable of meeting the functional use recitations of being implanted at that location since it is an implantable lead and nothing would prevent someone from implanting it in that location. Therefore, claims 12 and 13 were canceled.